

MONTANA OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

SCHOLASTIC REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

ANY COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL 7 - 12

MAY 2006

INTRODUCTION

The Montana Office of Public Instruction conducted a scholastic review of *Anywhere* High School 7-12 during the period of April 23-27, 2006.

The scholastic review team activities included a review of the documents collected for the school portfolio and profile, classroom observations (30) and formal interviews and informal discussions with teachers (30), students (15), parents (5), central office personnel (3), support staff members (13), the counselor (3), the librarian (1), school board members (2) and the principal.

The correlates and indicators for School Improvement rubric was the primary assessment instrument used during the visit. The team also compiled results from perception surveys, leadership assessments and efficiency reviews. All of these results were considered in the development of this report.

The scholastic review report was based upon examination of the documents provided in the school portfolio, team experiences and observations. The specific findings and recommendations are organized under the headings of Academic Performance, Learning Environment and Efficiency. Each of the nine correlates for success in Montana schools is addressed in the following pages.

The chairperson of the school support team was *Anybody*. The other team members were *Anybody*, *Anybody*, *Anybody*, Margaret Bowles and BJ Granbery.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The following Academic Performance Correlates address curriculum, classroom evaluation/assessment and instruction.

Correlate 1: The school develops and implements a curriculum that is rigorous, intentional and aligned to state standards.

Correlate 2: The school utilizes multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

Correlate 3: The school's instructional program actively engages all students by using effective, varied, and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

The following Learning Environment Correlates address school culture; student, family, and community support; and professional growth, development and evaluation.

Correlate 4: The school/district functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

Correlate 5: The school/district works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career, and developmental needs of students.

Correlate 6: The school/district provides research-based, results driven professional development opportunities for staff and implements performance evaluation procedures in order to improve teaching and learning.

EFFICIENCY

The following Efficiency Correlates address leadership, school structure and resources, and comprehensive and effective planning.

Correlate 7: School/district instructional decisions focus on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction, high performance expectations, creating a learning culture, and developing leadership capacity.

Correlate 8: The organization of the school/district maximizes use of time, all available space and other resources to maximize teaching and learning and supports high student and staff performance.

Correlate 9: The school/district develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive school improvement plan that communicates a clear purpose, direction and action plan focused on teaching and learning.

Findings: Academic Performance

Correlate 1 The school develops and implements a curriculum that is rigorous, intentional, and aligned to state standards.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 0 (0%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 7 (100%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 0 (%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

**1.1a. There is evidence that the curriculum is aligned with the Montana Content and Performance Standards and includes Indian Education for All.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

The Northwest Regional Lab report states that math instruction is not aligned; the only evidence of curriculum approaching alignment is English and science. Art curriculum appears to be aligned. There was no evidence of *Indian Education for All* being incorporated into the curriculum.

**1.1b. The district initiates and facilitates discussions among schools regarding curriculum standards to ensure they are clearly articulated across all levels (P-12), with particular attention to the inclusion of local cultural knowledge (as part of a living, constantly adopting system).
(Performance level rating = 2)**

There is a lack of evidence that the district has initiated or facilitated effective discussion among schools regarding curriculum standards in order to initiate discussion across grade levels. Departments are working independently rather than employing a district-wide discussion. Evidence validates that there is some attempt to include cultural knowledge. There does not appear to be vertical articulation with the feeder/receiver schools regarding student placement.

**1.1c. The district initiates and facilitates discussions between schools in the district in order to eliminate unnecessary overlaps and close gaps.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Representatives from the various schools have been working on curriculum development throughout the grades. However, the work of the teams does not appear to have impacted the

entire staff, There is limited knowledge of how instructional practices and curriculum need to be modified to eliminate overlaps and gaps

**1.1d. There is evidence of vertical communication with an intentional focus on key curriculum transition points within grade configurations (e.g., from primary to middle to high).
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Evidence does not indicate that the district engages in communication with an intentional focus on the transition points for student success. Informal discussion may occur, but there is not a systematic process.

**1.1e. The school curriculum provides specific links to continuing education, cultural awareness, life and career options.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

The school curriculum appears to be department specific, but within these curriculums there appears to be specific links to continuing education, cultural awareness, and life career options. A career counseling position has been created that is beginning to assist students in developing a high school education plan. Some connections are made to guide students in planning for post-secondary options. Cultural aspects are minimally integrated. Job shadowing exists in grades 4-12.

**1.1f. There is in place a systematic process for monitoring, evaluating and reviewing the curriculum.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

There is a curriculum committee that includes representatives from all the schools that worked on the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, but their work at the present time seems to be in the developing stages, as the work does not appear to have an impact at the individual classroom level. In many instances, evidence indicates that there is resistance to modifying classroom curriculum.

**1.1g. The curriculum provides access to a common academic core for all students.
“Common academic core-that is culturally responsive and available to all students.”
(Performance level rating = 2)**

There is a common belief among the educators in the building that all students have access to the same classes. Assignments to classes appear to be self-selected with the exception of some basic classes; once students are in a class, modifications may be made or the student may be reassigned.

Findings in: Academic Performance

Correlate 2 The school utilizes multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 1 (12.5%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 6 (75%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 1 (12.5%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

2.1a. Classroom assessments of student learning are frequent, rigorous and aligned with the Montana's Content and Performance Standards. (Performance level rating = 2)

Chapter tests and unit tests are utilized by many teachers. Some teachers have designed assignments that are aligned to the standards, but may not always elicit rigorous, proficient work. *Success For All* (SFA) has built in assessments that are aligned to Montana Content and Performance standards.

2.1b. Teachers collaborate in the design of authentic assessment tasks aligned with the standards and relevant to the school culture. (Performance level rating = 1)

Departments are working on curriculum, which must be in place prior to the design of authentic assessments. Evidence of authentic assessments is found in individual classrooms; however, ongoing collaborative dialogue does not appear to be happening. A clear understanding of authentic assessment is not evident.

2.1c. Students can articulate the academic expectations in each class and know what is required to be proficient. (Performance level rating = 2)

Students could not readily articulate academic expectations. Expectations were posted in various rooms, but the students did not appear to have a connection to the rubrics or expectations.

2.1d. Test scores are used to identify curriculum gaps.

(Performance level rating = 2)

The district curriculum director readily disseminates tests score information. The information focuses on MONTCAS (Montana Comprehensive Assessment System) and norm referenced tests. Multiple measures do not appear to be woven into the data.

2.1e. Multiple assessments are specifically designed to provide meaningful feedback on student learning for instructional purposes.

(Performance level rating = 2)

SFA is currently providing students with feedback on their progress; neither students nor teachers indicated that a variety of assessments were utilized. Meaningful feedback is not readily provided. SFA seems to be driving assessment.

2.1f. Performance standards are clearly communicated, evident in classrooms and observable in student work.

(Performance level rating = 2)

Individual teachers are communicating performance standards and exhibiting models of exemplary work; however, in many instances the textbooks appear to be the only reference to guide the students in completing work.

2.1g. Implementation of the state-required Assessment program is coordinated by school and district leadership.

(Performance level rating = 3)

As reported, the district is adhering to state-required assessment procedures.

2.1h. Samples of student work are analyzed to inform instruction, revise curriculum and pedagogy, and obtain information on student progress.

(Performance level rating = 2)

Some teachers are using student work samples and profiles to inform instruction and measure growth over time. For example, special education and SFA programs focus on analyzing student work to inform instruction, revise curriculum, and obtain information on student progress.

Findings in: Academic Performance

Correlate 3 The school's instructional program actively engages all students by using effective, varied, and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 0 (0%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 4 (50%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 4 (50%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

**3.1a. There is evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies are used in all classrooms.
(Performance level rating = 1)**

There is limited use by some individual teachers of effective and varied instructional strategies. There is much dependence on textbook, lecture, and teacher-centered approach with some notable exceptions.

**3.1b. Instructional strategies and learning activities are aligned with the state standards and assessment expectations for student learning and specific cultural needs.
(Performance level rating = 1)**

With a few exceptions, instructional strategies are most often aligned to the textbook rather than state standards or specific cultural needs.

**3.1c. Instructional strategies and activities are consistently monitored and aligned with the changing needs of a diverse student population to ensure various learning approaches and learning styles are addressed.
(Performance level rating = 1)**

With a few exceptions, instructional strategies and activities are not responsive to diverse needs, various learning approaches or learning styles.

**3.1d. Teachers demonstrate the content knowledge necessary to challenge and motivate students to high levels of learning.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Teachers seem to have appropriate certification and endorsements, but professional development is not focused enough to ensure that students are challenged and motivated to high levels of learning.

**3.1e. There is evidence that teachers incorporate the use of technology in their classrooms.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

There is very limited evidence. Use is hindered by a lack of appropriate maintenance and updating of the computer system.

**3.1f. Instructional resources (textbooks, supplemental reading and technology) are sufficient to effectively deliver the curriculum.
(Performance level rating = 1)**

The use of technology is limited and textbooks appear to be the primary resource. Resources do not reflect diversity. The media center is an exception regarding this.

**3.1g. Teachers examine and discuss student work collaboratively and use this information to inform their practice.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Collaborative planning time is not part of current master schedule. Some evidence of collaboration is found in the math and English departments.

**3.1h. There is evidence that homework is frequent and monitored and tied to instructional practice.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Instructional follow-up or specific teacher feedback is sometimes provided for homework for individual students.

Findings in: **Learning Environment**

Correlate 4 The school/district functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 1 (9%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 10 (91%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 0 (0%) received level 1 - Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

**4.1a. There is leadership support for a safe, orderly, culturally sensitive and equitable learning environment (e.g., culture reviews/school opinion surveys).
(Performance level rating = 2)**

A strong majority of staff feel that leadership supports a safe, orderly environment. Physical structure of the schools assists in supporting this safe learning environment. (Locked doors, resource officer, teachers in the hallways, culturally appropriate material displayed). Progress with cultural sensitivity is evident.

Some students were seen arriving late, or not being required to participate in meaningful classroom experiences, undermining the ability to provide an equitable learning environment. Tardiness and attendance issues were raised as major barriers in maintaining orderly, equitable learning. Additionally, lack of consistency enforcing the student behavioral rules contributes to the lack of order and equitable environment.

4.1b. Leadership creates experiences that foster the belief that all children can learn at high levels in order to motivate staff to produce continuous improvement in student learning.
(Performance level rating = 2)

School leadership has declared a strong commitment to the belief that all students can learn at high levels. However, leaders are new in their positions. Succeeding years will be needed to demonstrate commitment to the vision of high expectations.

4.1c. Teachers hold high expectations for all students academically, culturally, emotionally, physically and behaviorally, and this is evidenced in their practice.
(Performance level rating = 2)

High expectations for all students does not appear to be a belief that all teachers have incorporated into their practice. Expectations seem to vary for diverse learners. A mission statement exists, but student expectations are not based on the mission statement. Surveys, observations, and interviews confirm student behaviors disrupt instruction, indicating that high expectations are not for all students.

4.1d. Teachers and non-teaching staff are involved in both formal and informal decision-making processes regarding teaching and learning.
(Performance level rating = 2)

The monthly Wednesday early-out provides a structure for teachers to discuss issues, concerns, and professional needs. Teachers are provided the freedom to make decisions regarding their own classroom instruction. Teachers and non-teachers are aware of the mission, but it is not driving decision making.

4.1e. Teachers recognize and accept their professional role in student success and failure.
(Performance level rating =2)

Teachers verbalize concern over the students' success or failure, but there appears to be an abundance of looking beyond the classroom to explain student failures (home life, parents, peers, attendance, tardiness, etc.).

4.1f. The school intentionally assigns staff to maximize opportunities for all students to have access to the staff's instructional strengths.
(Performance level rating = 3)

All certified staff are teaching in their endorsed areas. Student/teacher ratio is exemplary.

**4.1g. Teachers communicate regularly with families about individual student's progress (e.g., engage through conversation).
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Parent-teacher conference and telephone calls are utilized to contact families about individual student progress. Parents are able to request weekly progress reports. Every three weeks reports are sent out to families whose child is failing a class.

**4.1h. There is evidence that the teachers and staff care about students and inspire their best efforts.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Teachers demonstrate caring about students, but high expectations are not readily communicated to all students. Praise and nurturing do not connect to high achievement and best efforts. Expectations vary from teacher to teacher. At the junior/high school the homeroom is not used for an advisee/advisor relationship.

**4.1i. Multiple communication strategies and contexts are used for the dissemination of information to all stakeholders.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

The school staff uses limited technology to communicate with stakeholders. The software program *School Master* has been implemented for mandatory grades. Other forms of communication are newspaper and radio, but a plan appears to be limited. *School Master* needs to be utilized by all staff.

**4.1j. There is evidence that student achievement is highly valued and publicly celebrated in a manner that is culturally appropriate (e.g., displays of student work, assemblies).
(Performance level rating = 2)**

Schools in the district are working diligently to publicly celebrate student achievements (academics, attendance, behavior, and extra-curricular). Assemblies, field trips, prizes and other forms of incentives are used to recognize appropriate student behaviors. Extra-curricular activities appear to take precedence over curricular achievements.

There are limited displays of student work and scoring rubrics need to be displayed consistently. Some teachers are making efforts to display good student work.

**4.1k. The school/district provides support for the physical, cultural, socio-economic, and intellectual needs of all students, which reflects a commitment to equity and an appreciation of diversity through policies, curriculum and instruction.
(Performance level rating = 2)**

The district addresses meeting the needs of all students with an appreciation of diversity. Although established, the district is not adequately providing the necessary support.

There are displays and posters that are culturally appropriate. Positive posters are displayed which adds to the educational atmosphere.

Findings in: Learning Environment

Correlate 5 The school/district works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career, and developmental needs of students.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 3 (60%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 2 (40%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 0 (0%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

5.1a Families and the community are active partners in the educational process and work together with the school/district staff to promote programs and services for all students, based on high expectations and Montana Content and Performance Standards. (Performance Level Rating = 2)

Family and communities are not active partners. Open communication between the tribal council and school board is not evident. Communication with the home is generally reactive. Parents are welcome in the school, but it is not perceived by the community as a genuine invitation.

5.1b. Structures are in place to ensure that all students have access to all the curriculum e.g., school guidance, Extended School Services). (Performance Level Rating = 3)

The administration and teachers affirm that all students have access to the curriculum. Ample student support is in place (career counseling, extra care, after school programs, school counselor, ZAP, etc).

5.1c. The school/district provides organizational structures and supports instructional practices to reduce barriers to learning. (Performance Level Rating = 2)

Resources are in place to assist students in learning. Specific support programs are abundant and in various stages of implementation. In many instances, there is a lack of incorporation of effective instructional strategies at the classroom level, or students that are experiencing learning

problems are not required to seek support. There does not seem to be a strong correlation between existing support system and student success or a desire to graduate.

**5.1d. Students are provided with a variety of opportunities to receive additional assistance to support their learning beyond the initial classroom instruction.
(Performance Level Rating = 3)**

Students are provided with a variety of opportunities including extended school services. Teachers are collaborating with existing support services. Programs such as service learning and Title I are available.

**5.1e. The school maintains an accurate student record system that provides timely information pertinent to the student's academic and educational development.
(Performance Level Rating = 3)**

Student records seem to be appropriately maintained.

Findings in: Learning Environment

Correlate 6 The school/district provides research-based, results driven professional development opportunities for staff and implements performance evaluation procedures in order to improve teaching and learning.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 0 (0%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 10 (83%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 2 (17%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

**6.1a. There is evidence of support for the long-term professional growth needs of the individual staff members. This includes both instructional and leadership growth.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The district encourages life-long learners in its mission statement and Master's degrees are encouraged. There is not a long-term plan for professional development in place although professional development opportunities are program driven and self-selected. There is no professional development offered that enhances leadership capabilities and overall, professional development does not seem to be tied to the school's mission and belief statements.

61b. The school has an intentional plan for building instructional capacity through ongoing professional development.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

The school professional development planning does not consider both individual and school-wide needs. Although professional development is aligned to the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, short and long-term professional development is not driven by student achievement data. The SFA process does show some consideration here.

6.1c. Staff development priorities are set in alignment with goals for student performance and the individual professional growth plans of the staff.
Performance Level Rating = 2)

There is no evidence that an individual staff member growth plan in existence nor is there an evaluation process for identifying the professional development needs of individual staff members.

SFA has been adopted to be in alignment with the goals for student performance.

6.1d. Plans for school improvement directly connect goals for student learning and the priorities set for the school and district staff development activities.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

The math and reading programs are aligned to school improvement goals through the SFA program, but other subject areas are not aligned.

There is no evidence of a survey being conducted to determine priorities for school professional development and no formal process has been used to determine professional development needs.

6.1e. Professional development is ongoing and job-embedded. Specific to the learning community.
(Performance Level Rating = 1)

The SFA trainers arrive once in the fall of the year, but the overall training is not as intensive as it was previously. In other areas of professional development, there is no follow-up, no time for reflection, and there does not seem to be an emphasis on continuous growth.

6.1f. Professional development planning shows a direct connection to an analysis of student achievement data.
(Performance Level Rating = 1)

Professional development on the analysis of assessment data is not provided and there is no evidence that the results of the analysis of data are used to inform professional development planning. Professional development does not seem to address student learning needs except for the SFA program, which was started as a result of a review of student reading scores.

**6.2a. The school/district provides a clearly defined evaluation process.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The evaluation process is covered in policy and the negotiated agreement. It is a clearly defined process and is tied to the individual growth needs of the staff. Evaluation discussion does take place between the principals and the staff providing ample feedback. The evaluation process is not specifically related to the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan.

**6.2b. Leadership provides the fiscal resources for the appropriate professional growth and development of certified staff based on identified needs.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The school leadership provides resources for professional development, although these resources are not fully utilized. The available resources are not directly related to a long range plan or process.

**6.2c. The school/district effectively uses the employee evaluation and the individual professional growth plan to improve staff proficiency.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Employee evaluation plans do not closely reflect the 5-year Comprehensive Evaluation Plan. The evaluation process is a part of individual staff growth, but there is no evidence that it consistently leads to increased staff proficiency.

**6.2d. Leadership provides and implements a process of personnel evaluation which meets or exceeds standards.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Leadership implements the evaluation system, which includes observation and feedback, but has limited impact on student achievement and teaching practices.

**6.2e. The school/district improvement plan identifies specific instructional leadership needs, board has strategies to address them.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The plan is in place with limited addressing of the needs of individual school administrators.

**6.2f. Leadership uses the evaluation process to provide teachers with the follow-up and support to change behavior and instructional practice.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Feedback is provided to those being observed, but not to the extent to ensure improvement in instructional practice or higher student achievement. An exception to this is the SFA reading program in grades 4-9.

Findings in: **Efficiency**

Correlate 7 The organization of the school/district maximizes use of time, all available space and other resources to maximize teaching and learning and supports high student and staff performance.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 2 (20%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 7 (70%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 1 (10%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

**7.1a. Leadership has developed and sustained a shared vision.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The leadership teams in grades 4-12 exhibit high energy, enthusiasm and a willingness and desire to improve the school environment. They have received and incorporated input in developing a mission statement and are currently working on a shared vision. Information has been distributed via handbooks.

There is little evidence at this point that the mission and belief statements are used to guide decisions or as a foundation when designing instructional programs.

**7.1b. Leadership decisions are focused on student academic performance and are data-driven and collaborative.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Specific data is analyzed and sometimes used to inform decisions. The district curriculum coordinator handles this area.

**7.1c. There is evidence that the school/district school improvement team disaggregates data for use in meeting the needs of a diverse population, communicates the information to school staff and incorporates the data systemically into the school's plan.
(Performance Level Rating = 1)**

The data is disaggregated and reviewed by the curriculum coordinator who works with representatives from the various buildings. These meetings appear to be held inconsistently at best. There is no evidence that staff members are using data to modify instructional strategies for the enhancement of student achievement.

The school board receives the coordinator's reports, but may not be using the data to target issues and gaps in student learning.

**7.1d. Leadership ensures all instructional staff have access to curriculum related materials and the training necessary to use curricular and data resources relating to Montana's academic content standards for public schools.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Knowledge of the Montana standards exist but this knowledge is not widely implemented by individual staff members. There has been limited training of staff regarding the standards. There is not a school leadership team specifically designed to build an internal training capacity for using the Montana standards.

**7.1e. Leadership ensures that time is protected and allocated to focus on curricular and instructional issues.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Observations indicated that there are disruptions of instructional time. Often times, the policies and regulations which are in place are not implemented by staff to reduce or prevent disruptions. Disruptions in class include the office intercom, tardy students, unmotivated students, misbehaving students and absent students returning.

A sixty minute reading block is implemented and protected from disruptions in grades 7 and 8.

**7.1f. Leadership plans and allocates resources, monitors progress, provides the organizational infrastructure, and removes barriers in order to sustain continuous school improvement.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Allocation of resources seems adequate, but these resources are not always consistent with the school's vision, mission, and priorities. Continuing efforts are exercised in this area and progress is being made. Examples of resource allocation that exudes positive results include the school resource officer program and the placing of smart boards in various classrooms.

**7.1g. The school/district leadership provides the organizational policy and resource infrastructure necessary for the implementation and maintenance of a safe, culturally sensitive and effective learning environment.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The school leadership is providing increased orderliness and safety within the schools. New leadership has had limited time to date to fully implement their plans. Some staff members are not helping to implement policies and procedures as needed. Increased cultural sensitivity is being addressed as well. The teaching/learning environment is developing in a positive direction and gaining the effectiveness needed.

**7.1h. District and school leadership provides a process for the development and the implementation of continuous school improvement.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

The 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan is complete and yearly revisions and effectiveness reports are provided. School policy follows the guidelines of the Montana School Boards Association. Leadership has implemented new school board study sessions for discussion of requests and providing for feedback to school and community. Evidence indicates that school staff have limited knowledge of policy which prevents consistent implementation.

**7.1i. There is evidence that the school board has an intentional focus on student academic performance.
(Performance Level Rating = 3)**

There is an intentional focus on student achievement. The curriculum coordinator provides data to the board of trustees and the school leadership makes recommendations for school improvement. The board has approved support programs and the actions resulting are aligned to student achievement.

**7.1j. There is evidence that the principal demonstrates leadership skills in the areas of academic performance, learning environment and efficiency, and a safe culturally responsive environment.
(Performance Level Rating = 3)**

First, it must be acknowledged that time is a factor in becoming an instructional leader. The principal is using such time efficiently and effectively. He is implementing policy and regulations and engaging staff in conversation on academic performance of students. There is evidence of knowledge of the Montana standards and a providing of organizational direction. The use of resources is maximized. Shared leadership is used with assistance coming from the school resource officer as needed.

Findings in: Efficiency

Correlate 8 The organization of the school/district maximizes use of time, all available space and other resources to maximize teaching and learning and supports high student and staff performance.

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 5 (50%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 5 (50%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 0 (0%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

- 8.1a. There is evidence that the school is organized to maximize use of all available resources to support high student and staff performance and provide extended learning time and culturally relevant learning activities.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

The school board has regular work sessions to discuss school information. At this point, staff committees are not appointed or active. Overall procedures that would maximize the use of school resources are minimal and poorly communicated. Resources are allocated that sporadically augment student achievement.

- 8.1b. The master class schedule reflects all students have access to all of the curriculum.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

The offerings in the master schedule address the Montana content and performance standards and sufficient course offerings are provided. Students have access to all of the curriculum, at least in theory (not all students have access to the keyboarding classes due to scheduling conflicts). Adopted policy provides equitable access to the curriculum, but specific interruptions in learning the curriculum are often present.

- 8.1c. The instructional and non-instructional staff are allocated and organized based upon the learning needs of the students.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

All teachers are properly assigned.

- 8.1d. There is evidence that the staff makes efficient use of instructional time to maximize student learning.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

The classroom management and organizational practices of some teachers ensure that instructional use of class time is maximized. Other instructional areas are more disruptive and instructional time is minimal. Enforcement of behavioral rules is inconsistent among staff.

- 8.1e. Staff promotes team planning vertically and horizontally across content areas and grade configurations that is focused on the goals, objectives and strategies in the improvement plan (e.g., common planning time for content area teachers; emphasis on learning time and not seat time; and integrated units).**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

Collaborative time is not focused on the goals of the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan in all content areas/grade levels. There is no evidence of discussion regarding transition from grade 6 to grade 7.

There is a Wednesday early out each month.

- 8.1f. The schedule is intentionally aligned with the school's mission and designed to ensure that all staff provide quality instructional time (e.g., flex time, organization based on developmental needs of students, interdisciplinary units, cultural needs, etc.)**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

There is not evidence that the mission drives the development of schedules. The developmental needs and learning styles of students may be considered in student scheduling, but are not a priority. Some staff members offer a variety of effective instructional strategies while others do not.

- 8.2a. The school/district provides a clearly defined process to provide equitable and consistent use of fiscal resources.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

The schools and district provide equitable and consistent use of fiscal resources. The central office has a clearly defined process for providing resources.

- 8.2b. The school/district budget reflects decisions made about discretionary funds and resources are directed by an assessment of need or a required plan, all of which consider appropriate data.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

Expenditures of funds appear to support the vision and mission statement of the school.

- 8.2c. The school board analyzed funding and other resource requests to ensure the requests are tied to the school/s plan and identified priority needs.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

Budget decisions are data-informed and aligned with the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan.

- 8.2d. State and federal program resources are allocated and integrated (Safe Schools, Title I, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, etc.) to address student needs identified by the school/district.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

Revenue is from multiple sources and is sufficient for employees and administration. Funds are allocated to support identified student needs as much as needed or identified.

Findings in: **Efficiency**

- Correlate 9 The school/district develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive school improvement plan that communicates a clear purpose, direction and action plan focused on teaching and learning.**

Based on interviews and observations conducted by the School Support Team members and their inspections of pertinent documents and materials, it was concluded that in this Correlate the various indicators received the following performance level ratings:

- 0 (0%) received level 4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation
- 4 (25%) received level 3 – Fully functional and operational level of development and implementation
- 10 (62.5%) received level 2 – Limited development or partial implementation
- 2 (12.5%) received level 1 – Little or no development or implementation

A brief description of the indicator ratings follows.

**9.1a. There is evidence that a collaborative process was used to develop the vision, beliefs, mission and goals that engage the school community as a community of learners.
(Performance Level Rating = 1)**

There is no evidence that a collaborative process was used to develop the vision, beliefs, mission and goals of the district. The vision and mission statements were not visually displayed for stakeholder view.

**9.2a. There is evidence the school/district planning process involves collecting, managing and analyzing data.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Data is used to identify and prioritize areas of need for the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan. It is not clear whether data is utilized at the classroom level for improvement.

**9.2b. The school/district uses data for school improvement planning.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Specific analysis of data has not been fully explored: the data is not used in a consistent and deliberate manner.

**9.3a. School and district plans reflect learning research, current local, state and national expectations for student learning and are reviewed by a planning team.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

There is no evidence that the latest educational research is utilized. SFA does use some of the latest research in the program.

**9.3b. The school/district analyzes their students' unique learning needs.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

Analyzed student performance data is not always used to identify students that have special learning needs, or the data is inadequate to help the school identify gaps.

- 9.3c. The desired results for student learning are defined.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

Not all staff members share a sense of responsibility for achieving the goals of the plan.

- 9.4a. Perceived strengths and limitations of the school/district instructional and organizational effectiveness are identified using the collected data.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

Data is not always used to inform school improvement planning.

- 9.4b. The school/district goals for building and strengthening the capacity of the school/district instructional and organizational effectiveness are defined.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

The goals are specifically stated for the ITED and ITBS but are not stated for the CRT.

- 9.5a. The action steps for school improvement are aligned with the school improvement goals and objectives.**
(Performance Level Rating = 2)

There is a profound gap in achievement between the Indian and non-Indian population.

- 9.5b. The plan identifies the resources, timelines, and persons responsible for carrying out each activity.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

Adequate funding resources and other resources are supporting the plan and the timelines for the plan are realistic. Specific people need to be identified for each action component of the plan.

- 9.5c. The means for evaluating the effectiveness of the improvement plan are established.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

School leadership systematically conducts implementation and impact checks to monitor the effectiveness of the activities.

- 9.5d. The improvement plan is aligned with the school's profile, beliefs, mission, desired results for student learning and analysis of instructional and organizational effectiveness.**
(Performance Level Rating = 3)

Yes, there is alignment.

**9.6a. The plan is implemented as developed.
(Performance Level Rating = 1)**

Staff members do not have sufficient awareness of the 5-Year Comprehensive Education Plan to be involved in its implementation.

**9.6b. The school evaluates the degree to which it achieves the goals and objectives for student learning set by the plan.
(Performance Level Rating = 3)**

School leadership evaluates the degree to which goals and objectives for student learning are being met.

**9.6c. The school evaluates the degree to which it achieves the expected impact on classroom practice and student performance specified in the plan.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

There is data collection and analysis of the data but impact on classroom practice is not evident.

**9.6d. There is evidence of attempts to sustain the commitment to continuous improvement.
(Performance Level Rating = 2)**

New areas for needed improvement may be identified, but objectives are not always specified.